

anchorage assembly (30). Claim 4 was amended and included the limitation that the latching member pivots about a pin.

I respectfully disagree with the obviousness basis with respect to the disclosed locking mechanism. Post member (20) does not need to be moved with respect to anchorage assembly (30) in order to be locked in place because the locking mechanism is not directly mounted to post member (20), as **Boots et al.** and **Higginson** teach. Neither **Boots et al.** nor **Higginson** disclosed a locking mechanism mounted to a third tubular member (42) that is movable with respect to the anchorage tubular member and security post member.

Higginson's patent discloses a locking mechanism that has to be actuated by a user through rotation of handle (18) in order to actuate the latch member (cross bar 23). Boots' patent discloses a much complex locking mechanism that includes a pair of latching members (rectangular-shaped latches 42,43) actuated by respective leaf springs (44,45), and a user needs to raise security post member (30) to a predetermined position with respect to the anchorage housing so that the latching members engage the latch groove (19). While in the present invention, a simple push-down helped by the gravity pressure will make one latch member (44) be inserted inside any of the four cavities or bays. Also, the disclosed latching member (44) has a totally different design than cited patents, that in combination with the whole locking assembly provide a very effective and less costly apparatus. Since 1994 when I filed my previous patent 5,520,479, I am manufacturing security posts. In 1999 I started manufacturing this invention with a great positive response from the consumers and experts in this field due to the simplicity and effectiveness of the present invention.

Another difference is that the present invention (rectangular cross section) has four cavities or bays to receive latch member 44 so that the user can indistinctly insert security post member inside the anchorage housing, while Higginson's patent does need guidance so that the latching members are cooperatively received through a pair of slots.

Another difference is that the present invention is designed in that manner that is easy to remove from the anchorage housing, in contrast with Boots' patent that requires a second locking mechanism and proper tool.

I believe the present patent application is now allowable and ready to be passed to publication and request and early favorable action.

Respectfully submitted,


Rigoberto Hernandez